

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Ste. 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1301 Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01726 (RCL)

**MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION  
AND REQUEST FOR EXPEDITED CONSIDERATION**

**COMES NOW** Plaintiff Landmark Legal Foundation (“Landmark”), by and through undersigned counsel and pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 65 and Local Rule 65.1, respectfully moves for an order to compel Defendant Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”) to produce by 5:00 pm, December 24, 2012 all records responsive to Landmark’s August 17, 2012 Freedom of Information Act request related to Reconsideration of Certain New Source and Startup/Shutdown Issues: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units, 77 Fed. Reg. 71323 (EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0044; FRL-9733-2);

Landmark also respectfully moves for an order compelling Defendant EPA to expedite processing of all additional records responsive to Landmark's August 17, 2012 FOIA request and produce them by Friday, January 4, 2013.

Additionally, Landmark respectfully moves for an order compelling Defendant EPA, its agents and officials to preserve all information potentially responsive to Landmark's request.

Plaintiff respectfully requests that the Court direct EPA Administrator Lisa Jackson to ensure that any order issued pursuant to this motion is carried out and enforced.

Pursuant to Local Rule 7(m), counsel for Plaintiff attempted to confer with Heather Graham Oliver, counsel for Defendant. Defendant's counsel informed Plaintiff's counsel that EPA opposes this motion.

Landmark respectfully requests expedited consideration of this motion for preliminary injunction given the timeliness of the issues involved.

Respectfully submitted,

Landmark Legal Foundation

DATED: December 12, 2012

s/ Michael J. O'Neill  
Michael J. O'Neill #478669  
Mark R. Levin  
Landmark Legal Foundation  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Suite 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176  
703-554-6100  
703-554-6119 (facsimile)  
[mike@landmarklegal.org](mailto:mike@landmarklegal.org)

Richard P. Hutchison  
Landmark Legal Foundation  
3100 Broadway, Suite 1210  
Kansas City, MO 64111  
816-931-5559  
816-931-1115 (facsimile)

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Motion for Preliminary Injunction (accompanied by Proposed Order) was filed electronically with the Court by using the CM/ECF system on this 12th day of December, 2012. Parties that are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the District Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Michael J. O'Neill  
Michael J. O'Neill  
Attorney for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Ste. 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1301 Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01726 (RCL)

**STATEMENT OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES IN  
SUPPORT OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY INJUNCTION**

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. Pro. 65 and Local Rule 65.1, Plaintiff Landmark Legal Foundation ("Landmark" or "Plaintiff") respectfully submits this Statement of Points and Authorities in Support of its Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Landmark seeks an order from the Court directing Defendant Environmental Protection Agency ("EPA" or "Defendant") to produce by 5 pm on December 24, 2012 all records responsive to Landmark's August 17, 2012 Freedom of Information Act request at issue in this cause of action related to a highly politically charged final rule (as described below) noticed after the filing of this complaint and to expedite production of all other requested records. Additionally, Landmark requests the Court issue an order directing EPA, its officials, employees and agents, to take necessary steps to preserve all information potentially responsive to Landmark's request.

Despite nearly four months and an agreement to narrow the scope of its request, Landmark has not received a single piece of paper responsive to the Freedom of Information Act request at issue in this cause of action. Landmark's request seeks records related to EPA rulemaking proposals for which final action may have been delayed for political reasons during 2012 until after the November, 2012 presidential election. Since the filing of this complaint, EPA has noticed for comment an extremely controversial final rule with a December 31, 2012 comment deadline. This is precisely the kind of rule about which Landmark was concerned when it submitted its FOIA request. Despite requests for immediate production of responsive records, EPA has offered to provide responsive records by January 31, 2013 -- 31 days **after** the comment period's expiration. Landmark seeks this preliminary injunction requiring EPA to produce responsive records immediately in compliance with EPA's FOIA obligations.

#### **I. Factual Background.**

In July 2012, major media outlets published news reports indicating that EPA was intentionally delaying the issuance of controversial new regulations until after the November election. Pl.'s Complaint at ¶ 6. Other news reports suggested that political observers “see a crass political calculation at play: Don’t give Romney any more ammunition before the election – and then open the floodgates after the polls close.” Pl.'s Complaint at ¶ 8.

Concerned by these reports, on August 17, 2012, Landmark requested records relating to all proposed rules or regulations that have not been finalized by the EPA. Pl.'s Complaint at ¶ 10, Pl's Complaint Exhibit 1 (Landmark's Aug. 17, 2012 FOIA Request). Specifically, Landmark is seeking the following:

Any and all records identifying the names of individuals, groups and/or organizations outside the EPA with which the EPA, EPA employees, EPA contractors and/or EPA consultants have had communications of any kind relating

to all proposed rules or regulations that have not been finalized by the EPA between January 1, 2012 and August 17, 2012. For the purposes of this request, “communications of any kind” does not include public comments or other records available on the rulemaking docket.

Any and all records indicating an order, direction or suggestion that the issuance of regulations, the announcements of regulations and/or public comment of regulations should be slowed or delayed until after November 2012 or the presidential election of 2012.

Landmark requested a waiver of fees and expedited processing. Pl.’s Complaint at ¶ 12, Pl.’s Complaint Exhibit 1 (Landmark’s Aug. 17, 2012 FOIA Request). In its request, Landmark explained that timely release of responsive records was necessary because such records relate directly to whether EPA was delaying implementation of crucial regulations for political reasons. Landmark noted that delaying finalization “raises the possibility that the EPA’s leadership is intentionally concealing its regulatory activity from an unwary public, and/or the possibility that the EPA’s leadership is putting the partisan interests of a particular candidate above the safety of the general public...” Pl.’s Complaint, Exhibit 1 (Landmark’s Aug. 17, 2012 FOIA Request). Further, Landmark explained that the “health and wellbeing of the public as well as the economic wellbeing of the country are at stake with improper environmental regulation. Pl.’s Complaint, Exhibit 1 (Landmark’s Aug. 17, 2012 FOIA Request).

EPA acknowledged receipt of the Request on August 29, 2012 and, at the same time, granted Landmark’s request for a fee waiver but denied expedited processing. Pl.’s Complaint Exhibit 2. Shortly thereafter, on September 14, 2012, Landmark appealed this denial. Pl.’s Complaint at ¶ 14.

On September 27, 2012 EPA requested that Landmark narrow the scope of its request. Affidavit of Matthew C. Forys at ¶ 4. Landmark agreed to limit the scope of its request to “senior officials in EPA HQ”. Affidavit of Matthew C. Forys at ¶ 5.

On October 18, 2012, EPA rejected Landmark's appeal of EPA's denial of expedited processing. Pl's Complaint at ¶ 15. Landmark initiating the instant suit on October 22, 2012.

On November 29, 2012 the Assistant United States Attorney representing EPA informed Landmark that EPA intended to have all responsive records produced by the end of January, 2013. Affidavit of Richard P. Hutchison at ¶ 7.

On November 30, 2012 -- the very next day -- EPA issued an extremely politically controversial proposed final rule falling squarely under Landmark's FOIA request. The rule is the Reconsideration of Certain New Source and Startup/Shutdown Issues: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units, 77 Fed. Reg. 71323 (EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0044; FRL-9733-2).

This rule, originally finalized on February 16, 2012, "is expected to be one of the most costly rules ever issued by EPA. It has also proven highly controversial, drawing numerous legal challenges . . ." (King & Spalding Energy Newsletter, September 2012, available at <http://www.kslaw.com/library/newsletters/EnergyNewsletter/2012/September/article1.html>.) On July 20, 2012, EPA announced that it would reconsider the rule after the upcoming presidential election. Exhibit 1, July 20, 2012 EPA Letter to Patricia T. Barmeyer. Accordingly, any records responsive related to this reconsideration matter are covered by Landmark's FOIA request. This is precisely the anticipated scenario giving rise to Landmark's request for expedited processing and justifying the issuance of a preliminary injunction. It is crucial to have these records to

determine whether EPA engaged in any improper rulemaking activities and to ensure that the public record is complete.

## **II. Landmark Is Entitled To Injunctive Relief and Expedited Processing Of Its Request.**

### **A. Landmark satisfies the requirements for injunctive relief.**

The court may issue interim injunctive relief when the movant demonstrates:

(1) a substantial likelihood of success on the merits, (2) that it would suffer irreparable injury should the injunction not be granted, (3) the injunction would not substantially injure other interested parties and (4) that the public interest would be furthered by the injunction.

*Mova Pharm Corp. v. Shalala*, 140 F.3d 1060, 1066 (D.C. Cir. 1998). These factors are to be considered on a sliding scale where “a party can compensate for a lesser showing on one factor by making a very strong showing on another factor.” *Washington Post v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 459 F. Supp. 2d 61, 67 (D.D.C. 2006). Moreover, this court has considered motions for preliminary injunctions from parties seeking expedited processing of their respective FOIA requests. *See Washington Post v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 459 F. Supp. 2d at 61, *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. Dept. of Justice*, 416 F. Supp. 2d 30 (D.D.C. 2006), *Aguilera v. FBI*, 941 F. Supp. 144, 152-53 (D.D.C. 1996).

Success on the merits “does not necessarily mean that [the requester] will receive any documents.” *Washington Post v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 459 F. Supp. 2d at 68. Instead, courts look to “whether the plaintiff is entitled to full FOIA processing of its records request.” *Id.* A requester is entitled to full FOIA processing when the request seeks records “created or obtained by the agency” and when the records “are under agency control.” *DOJ v. Tax Analysts*, 492 U.S. 136, 144-145 (1989). “The burden is on the agency to demonstrate, not the requester to disprove, that the materials sought are not ‘agency records.’” *Id.* at 142 n. 3.



Landmark seeks records related to EPA's communications with external groups and individuals, including executive branch officials, over proposed rules or regulations. If they exist, these records were created by EPA officials whether they exist in the form of emails, memorandums or letters. They are under EPA control in that they reside in EPA files or electronic databases. At a minimum, the FOIA obligates EPA to process Landmark's request.

Irreparable injury in the context of expediting a FOIA request occurs when a delay in production results in disclosure of "stale information." *See Payne Enters. v. United States*, 837 F.2d 486, 494 (D.C. Cir. 1998) (noting that "stale information is of little value.") Courts also recognize the infliction of irreparable injury when "there exists an 'urgency to inform the public concerning the actual or alleged Federal Government activity.'" *Washington Post v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 459 F. Supp. 2d at 74 (citing 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v)(II)).

A delay in producing responsive records could affect legal challenges to finalized regulations. If EPA placed partisan political interests ahead of the health and wellbeing of the populations, these factors could be relevant in any regulatory challenge brought by interested parties. Moreover, a delay in finalizing environmental regulations raises the possibility that the EPA's leadership is intentionally concealing its regulatory activity from and unwary public.

In short, the December 31, 2012 comment deadline for the November 30, 2012 "Reconsideration of Certain New Source and Startup/Shutdown Issues" makes it impossible for Plaintiff to submit meaningful comments on the record of improper politicization by EPA administrators without the relief Plaintiff seeks. Since EPA has already announced that it will not consider extending the comment deadline (see 77 Fed. Reg. 71323), Landmark and the public will be denied any opportunity to submit adequate comments should any records responsive to the FOIA request pertain to this particular rule.

Producing records on an expedited basis does not burden other parties. Its own Records Management Policy and the Records Retention Act obligates EPA to “make and preserve records containing adequate and proper documentation of their organization, function, policies, decisions, procedures and essential transactions. These records are public property and must be managed according to applicable laws and regulations.” EPA Records Management Memorandum, Classification No.: CIO 2155.1, available at <http://www.epa.gov/records/>. See also 44 U.S.C. § 31 and § 33. Thus, EPA is obligated to preserve any responsive records. Accelerating their production does not place an undue burden on EPA.

Finally, the public interest favors expedited processing and production in that these records are relevant to the propriety of forthcoming regulations. As stated previously, the records will show whether EPA delayed finalization of certain regulations based on political expediency.

**B. Landmark satisfies the requirements for expedited processing.**

Before discussing the factors a court will consider when determining whether to award expedited processing, it is crucial to note that even in cases where the requester doesn’t seek expedited processing, “unreasonable delays in disclosing non-exempt documents violate the intent and purpose of the FOIA and the courts have a duty to prevent [these] abuses.”

*Washington Post v. Dept. of Homeland Security*, 459 F. Supp. 2d at 66 (citing *Payne Enters. v. United States*, 837 F.2d at 494). Landmark filed its request over 90 days ago and has yet to receive a single responsive document. Affidavit of Matthew C. Forsys ¶ 7. EPA has already failed to uphold its obligations under the FOIA.

To receive expedited processing, a FOIA request must show a “compelling need” by either: (1) establishing that the failure to obtain the records quickly could reasonably be expected

to pose an imminent threat to the life or physical safety of an individual; or (2) if the requestor is one that is “primarily engaged in disseminating information” and “has an “urgency to inform the public concerning actual or alleged Federal Government activity.” 5 U.S.C. § 552(a)(6)(E)(v); 40 CFR 2.104(E)(1)(ii). Among the factors to be considered as to whether there is a compelling need are “(1) whether the request concerns a matter of current exigency to the American public; (2) whether the consequences of delaying a response would compromise a significant recognized interest; and (3) whether the request concerns federal governments activity.” *ACLU v. Department of Justice*, 321 F. Supp. 2d 24, 29 (D.D.C. 2004).

A public interest group will be considered an entity that is “primarily engaged in disseminating information” when it “gathers information of potential interest into a distinct work, and distributes that work to an audience.” *Elec. Privacy Info. Ctr. v. Dept. of Defense*, 241 F. Supp. 2d 5 (D.D.C. 2003).

As part of its mission as a tax-exempt, public interest law firm, Landmark investigates, litigates and publicizes matters related to improper and/or illegal government activity. Affidavit of Richard P. Hutchison ¶ 4. Among Plaintiff's primary activities is the dissemination to the public information obtained through the Freedom of Information Act. Affidavit of Richard P. Hutchison ¶ 5. As stated in its original request, upon receipt of responsive information, Landmark will post records on its website, include the information in its newsletters, publish articles in large circulation print media, and issue press releases to a wide range of media outlets. Affidavit of Richard P. Hutchison ¶ 6. Additionally, numerous newspapers, news programs, blogs and other media outlets discuss Landmark and its work regularly. For example, Landmark's request has already been the subject of a news report on Fox News. In short,

Landmark's ability to process information and activities and convey it in an understandable manner to the public makes it highly sought after for its opinion and editorial content.

Landmark is thus entitled to expedited processing of its request.

**III. Landmark Is Entitled To An Injunction Compelling EPA To Preserve Responsive Information.**

In a related case, *Landmark Legal Foundation v. Environmental Protection Agency* (1:00-cv-2338 (RCL)), Plaintiff submitted an identical FOIA request and sought an injunction compelling EPA to preserve repositories of potentially responsive information. Despite this Court's order, EPA failed to secure these repositories and failed to properly circulate the request to relevant officials. *Landmark Legal Foundation v. Environmental Protection Agency*, 272 F. Supp. 2d 70 (D.D.C. 2003).

A similar injunction is necessary in the present case. Contact between EPA officials and Landmark has been limited to communications related to Landmark's October agreement to limit the scope of its request to "senior officials in EPA HQ." Affidavit of Matthew C. Forsys ¶ 4. Further, Landmark has concerns the conclusion of this presidential term will result in significant staff turnover at EPA and a failure to produce responsive records.

Landmark will succeed on the merits as its request seeks agency records produced or maintained by EPA officials. Pl.'s Complaint ¶ 10. There have been no assurances of any steps to secure or produce records and there exists the potential of destruction of these records in the near future. Accordingly, Landmark could suffer irreparable injury should any responsive records be destroyed.

Directing EPA to preserve any repositories of potentially responsive records will not burden EPA as such an order provides an additional incentive to adhere to a preexisting legal duty as mandated by EPA document retention policies and the Records Retention Act.

Finally, this order will serve the public interest in ensuring records that could illuminate the public's understanding of EPA decision-making processes are not destroyed. As stated previously, these records will show whether EPA's leadership placed partisan interests ahead of the public welfare.

**IV. Conclusion.**

For reasons set forth in this memorandum, Landmark respectfully requests the Court issue an immediate injunction awarding Landmark's FOIA request expedited processing, require EPA to produce immediately responsive records, and order EPA to take steps necessary to ensure the preservation of all potentially responsive information.

Respectfully submitted,

Landmark Legal Foundation

DATED: December 12, 2012

s/ Michael J. O'Neill  
Michael J. O'Neill #478669  
Mark R. Levin  
Landmark Legal Foundation  
19415 Deerfield Ave  
Suite 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176  
703-554-6100  
703-554-6119 (facsimile)  
mike@landmarklegal.org

Richard P. Hutchison  
Landmark Legal Foundation  
3100 Broadway, Suite 1210  
Kansas City, MO 64111  
816-931-5559  
816-931-1115 (facsimile)  
rpetehutch@aol.com

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

Undersigned counsel hereby certifies that a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Memorandum of Points and Authorities In Support of Plaintiff's Preliminary Injunction was filed electronically with the Court by using the CM/ECF system on this 12th day of December, 2012. Parties that are registered CM/ECF users will be served by the District Court's CM/ECF system.

/s/ Michael J. O'Neill  
Michael J. O'Neill  
Attorney for Plaintiff

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Ste. 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1301 Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Defendant.

Case No. 1:12-cv-01726 (RCL)

**PROPOSED ORDER**

Before the court is Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction. Having considered Plaintiff's motion, the opposition thereto, and for good cause shown therein, the Court will grant the motion.

Accordingly, it is, this \_\_\_\_ day of December, 2012, hereby

**ORDERED** that Landmark Legal Foundation's application for preliminary injunction is **GRANTED**; it is further

**ORDERED** that Defendant Environmental Protection Agency is directed to produce by 5:00 pm, December 24, 2012 all records responsive to Landmark Legal Foundation's August 17, 2012 Freedom of Information Act Request related to Reconsideration of Certain New Source and Startup/Shutdown Issues: National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units and Standards of Performance for Fossil-



Fuel-Fired Electric Utility, Industrial-Commercial-Institutional, and Small Industrial-Commercial-Institutional Steam Generating Units, 77 Fed. Reg. 71323 (EPA-HQ-OAR-2009-0234; EPA-HQ-OAR-2011-0044; FRL-9733-2); and it is further

**ORDERED** that Defendant Environmental Protection Agency and its agents and employees are directed to expedite processing of all remaining records responsive to Landmark Legal Foundation's August 17, 2012 Freedom of Information Act Request and produce them to Plaintiff by Friday, January 4, 2013; and it is further

**ORDERED** that Defendant Environmental Protection Agency and its agents and employees are enjoined from destroying, transporting, removing or in any way tampering with information potentially responsive to Landmark Legal Foundation's August 17, 2012 Freedom of Information Act Request, pending further order of the Court:

**ORDERED** that the Environment Protection Agency Administrator, Lisa Jackson, is directed to ensure that this order is carried out and enforced.

---

Royce C. Lamberth  
United States District Judge

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Ste. 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1301 Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Defendant.

**AFFIDAVIT OF MATTHEW C. FORYS**

1. I am an attorney employed by Landmark Legal Foundation (“Landmark”).
2. As a normal course of my duties as an attorney, I draft, file and process Freedom of Information Act (“FOIA”) requests filed by Landmark.
3. On August 17, 2012 I sent via facsimile and overnight mail Landmark’s request to Defendant Environmental Protection Agency.
4. On September 27, 2012 I had a conversation with Jonathan Newton, from the EPA regarding the scope of Landmark’s FOIA request. Mr. Newton wanted to know whether Landmark would be willing to narrow the scope of its request to apply to “senior officials in EPA HQ.”
5. On October 5, 2012, I informed Mr. Newton that Landmark agreed to narrow the scope of its FOIA request to apply only to senior officials in EPA HQ.

6. To date, this is the extent of contact I have had with any officials from EPA.

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing to be true and correct.


**Executed on December 12, 2012**




Matthew C. Forys  
Landmark Legal Foundation

City/County of Leesburg/Loudoun  
Commonwealth of Virginia

The foregoing instrument was subscribed and sworn before me this 12<sup>th</sup> day of December, 2012  
by:



Matthew C. Forys

  
Notary Public

**LYDIA FLORES**  
**NOTARY PUBLIC 7524006**  
**COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA**  
**MY COMMISSION EXPIRES 06-30-2016**

Notary registration number: 7524006

My commission expires: 06/30/2016

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

LANDMARK LEGAL FOUNDATION  
19415 Deerfield Ave, Ste. 312  
Leesburg, VA 20176

Plaintiff,

vs.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
1301 Constitution Ave, NW  
Washington, DC 20004

Defendant.


**AFFIDAVIT OF RICHARD P. HUTCHISON**

1. I am an Vice President and General Counsel of Landmark Legal Foundation (“Landmark”).
2. In my capacity as Vice President, I am familiar with Landmark's programmatic activities and daily operations.
3. In the normal course of my duties as general counsel, I communicate with opposing counsel in pending litigation matters and have done so in this cause of action.
4. As a significant part of its mission as a tax-exempt, public interest law firm, Landmark investigates, litigates and publicizes instances of improper and/or illegal government activity.
5. Among Landmark's primary activities is the dissemination to the public information obtained through the Freedom of Information Act.

6. Upon receipt of responsive information, Landmark will post records on its website, include the information in its newsletters, publish articles in large circulation print media, and issue press releases to a wide range of media outlets.
7. In my capacity as general counsel, I had a telephone conversation with Assistant United States Attorney Heather D. Graham-Oliver on November 29, 2012 in which she indicated that Defendant EPA would produce records responsive to Plaintiff's FOIA request by January 31, 2013.
8. On December 12, 2012, I conferred with Ms. Graham-Oliver concerning Plaintiff's Motion for Preliminary Injunction, but was unable to resolve the issues giving rise to this motion.

I declare under penalty of perjury the foregoing to be true and correct.

**Executed on December 12, 2012**



Richard P. Hutchison  
Landmark Legal Foundation

STATE OF MISSOURI                    }  
  } SS  
COUNTY OF JACKSON                }

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 12th day of December, 2012.



  
Notary Public



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20460

July 20, 2012

OFFICE OF  
AIR AND RADIATION

Patricia T. Barmeyer  
King & Spalding LLP  
1180 Peachtree Street, N.E.  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-3521

Dear Ms. Barmeyer:

On February 16, 2012, the final rule titled "National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants From Coal- and Oil-Fired Electric Utility Steam Generating Units" was published in the Federal Register. (77 Fed. Reg. 9304). Thereafter, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) received several petitions for administrative reconsideration of the rule pursuant to section 307(d)(7)(B) of the Clean Air Act.

Some of those petitions raise issues associated with the new source emission standards contained in the final rule. I am writing to notify you that we intend to grant reconsideration of certain new source issues, including measurement issues related to mercury and the data set to which the variability calculation was applied when establishing the new source standards for particulate matter and hydrochloric acid, that may affect the new source standards. The EPA plans to issue a Federal Register notice shortly, initiating notice and comment rulemaking on the new source issues for which the Agency is granting reconsideration.

We anticipate that the focus of the reconsideration rulemaking will be a review of issues that are largely technical in nature. Our expectation is that under the reconsideration rule new sources will be required to install the latest and most effective pollution controls and will be able to monitor compliance with the new standards with proven monitoring methods. As a result, the final reconsideration rule will maintain the significant progress in protecting public health and the environment that was achieved through the rule published in February, while ensuring that the standards for new sources are achievable and measurable.

We intend to expedite this reconsideration rulemaking and complete the rulemaking by March of 2013. In this case, EPA also intends to exercise its discretion under section 307(d)(7)(B) of the Clean Air Act and will issue a notice in the Federal Register shortly that stays the effectiveness of the new source emission standards for three months.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Gina McCarthy", is positioned above the name and title.

Gina McCarthy  
Assistant Administrator

Cc: Peter S. Glaser  
Troutman Sanders LLP  
401 Ninth Street N.W., Suite 1000  
Washington, D.C. 20001  
*Counsel for*  
*Tenaska Trailblazer Partners, LLC*  
*Deseret Power Electric Cooperative*  
*Sunflower Electric Power Corporation*

Eric Groten  
Vinson & Elkins LLP  
2801 Via Fortuna, Suite 100  
Austin, TX 78746-7568  
*Counsel for*  
*White Stallion Energy Center, LLC*

Jeffrey R. Holmstead  
Bracewell & Giuliani LLP  
2000 K Street, NW  
Suite 500  
Washington, DC 20006-1872  
*Counsel for*  
*Tri-State Generation and Transmission Association, Inc.*

Mr. J. Randall Data  
President and Chief Operating Officer  
Babcock & Wilcox Power Generation Group  
20 South Van Buren Avenue  
Post Office Box 351  
Barberton, Ohio 44203-0351

Mr. Cecile M. Conroy  
Director, Legislative Affairs  
Government Affairs Department  
International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Ship Builders, Blacksmiths, and Forgers & Helpers  
1750 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Suite 335  
Washington, D.C. 20006

Mr. Ben Yamagata  
Executive Director  
Coal Utilization Research Council  
1050 Thomas Jefferson Street, N.W.  
Washington DC 20007

Mr. Douglas J. Weber  
Senior Corporate Counsel  
FirstEnergy  
76 South Main Street  
Akron, Ohio 44308

Mr. James M. McNeil  
Institute of Clean Air Companies  
2025 M Street, N.W.  
Suite 800  
Washington, D.C.

Ms. Christina Mullen  
Legal Secretary to Mary E. Smith, AAG  
Environmental Protection Division  
Attorney General of Texas  
Post Office Box 12548  
Austin, Texas 78711-2548

Mr. Lee B. Zeugin  
Hunton & Williams, LLP  
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037